

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,441	03/31/2004	Deniz Erdogmus	5853-406-1	5466
30448 AKERMAN SI	7590 01/23/2008 ENTERFITT	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3188			JACOB, MARY C	
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2123	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•	•	01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/814,441	ERDOGMUS ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mary C. Jacob	2123			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON acquire the application to become AB.	ATION.  ply be timely filed  IHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/31/	<u>′04</u> .				
2a) <u></u> □						
3)	,					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	•		
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-57 are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11)[	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received is have been received in A rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	-		
2)  Notice 3) Infor	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 			

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-57 have been presented for examination.

## Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-21, drawn to an EWC-LMS technique (see specification, paragraph 0026 and Figure 2), classified in class 703, subclass 2.
  - II. Claims 22-57, drawn to an REW technique (see specification, paragraph 0031 and Figure 3), classified in class 703, subclass 2.
- 3. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to two different methods, one being an Error Whitening Criterion-Least Means Squares technique, and the other being a Recursive Error Whitening Technique, both methods requiring different mathematical calculations, and therefore, a different search in the prior art directed toward each method set forth.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number:

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

- 4. A telephone call was made to Richard A. Hinson, Reg. No. 47,652 on 1/17/08 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i)

Application/Control Number:

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

## Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary C. Jacob whose telephone number is 571-272-6249. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAUL RODRIGUEZ SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mary C. Jacob Examiner AU2123

MCJ . 1/18/07

\*\*\*